

Steiner-Khamsi, Gita

Carole L. Hahn (1998). Becoming Political. Comparative Perspectives on Citizenship Education. Albany: State University of New York Press. 304 pages. [Rezension]

Tertium comparationis 5 (1999) 1, S. 2-5



Quellenangabe/ Reference:

Steiner-Khamsi, Gita: Carole L. Hahn (1998). Becoming Political. Comparative Perspectives on Citizenship Education. Albany: State University of New York Press. 304 pages. [Rezension] - In: *Tertium comparationis* 5 (1999) 1, S. 2-5 - URN: urn:nbn:de:0111-opus-33034 - DOI: 10.25656/01:3303

<https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0111-opus-33034>

<https://doi.org/10.25656/01:3303>

in Kooperation mit / in cooperation with:



WAXMANN
www.waxmann.com

<http://www.waxmann.com>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Die Nutzung stellt keine Übertragung des Eigentumsrechts an diesem Dokument dar und gilt vorbehaltlich der folgenden Einschränkungen: Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

Terms of use

We grant a non-exclusive, non-transferable, individual and limited right to using this document.

This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. Use of this document does not include any transfer of property rights and it is conditional to the following limitations: All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

Kontakt / Contact:

peDOCS
DIPF | Leibniz-Institut für Bildungsforschung und Bildungsinformation
Informationszentrum (IZ) Bildung
E-Mail: pedocs@dipf.de
Internet: www.pedocs.de

Mitglied der


Leibniz-Gemeinschaft

auch zwischen Ost- und Westeuropa (Pierre Laderrière).

Das vierte Kapitel vereinigt unter dem Titel „Länderstudien“ Beiträge, die der Tatsache Rechnung tragen, daß sich die Vergleichende Erziehungswissenschaft zunächst einmal darin bewähren muß, ein bestimmtes Bildungssystem in seiner je besonderen Eigenart zu untersuchen, um es dann in vergleichender Perspektive einzuordnen. Diesem allgemeinen Anliegen kommen die Beiträge auf zwei unterschiedlichen Wege nach: Der erste Weg, den der Rezensent für den die vergleichende Methode konstituierenden hält, bedient sich des „fremden Blicks“ (z.B. Christel Adick über Grundbildung in Afrika, Günter Brinkmann über Lehrerbildung in den Niederlanden), der andere läßt Wissenschaftler als Experten ihres jeweiligen Herkunftslandes zu Wort kommen (z.B. N.D. Nikandrov über das Bildungswesen der Russischen Föderation, Witold Tulasiewicz über die Marktorientierung im englischen Schulwesen, Makoto Yuki über Bildungverwaltung in Japan).

Das abschließende fünfte Kapitel („Historische Dimension“) thematisiert eine Dimension der Vergleichenden Erziehungswissenschaft, die insbesondere in Deutschland Tradition hat: Historisch-vergleichende Forschung kann die Genese sowie die Dynamik von Bildungssystemen in den Blick nehmen und dadurch den bestimmenden Faktoren für Veränderungsprozesse unter Aspekten der geschichtlichen Zeit (und möglicherweise auch Hypothesen über zukünftige Entwicklungschancen) auf die Spur kommen oder auch verschiedene Interpretationen geschichtlicher Phänomene und Prozesse analysieren. In diesem Zusammenhang verdienen der Beitrag von Siegfried Baske über die neuhumanistische Phase des Jenkauer Conradinums im Urteil der deutschen und polnischen Bildungsgeschichte sowie der Beitrag von Marianne Krüger-Potratz zur Geschichte ausländischer Schüler in deutschen Schulen Erwähnung.

Die angezeigte Schrift dokumentiert die weltweiten wissenschaftlichen und persönlichen Kontakte von Wolfgang Mitter, dem diese Schrift zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet ist. Sie spiegelt auch das breite Spektrum der Themen und Zugänge, die das Œuvre des Geehrten prägen. Es ist das Verdienst der Herausgeber(innen) und Autor(innen), daß diese Schrift dank ihres systematischen Anspruchs und Zuschnitts die für Festschriften häufig kennzeichnenden Merkmale der Zufälligkeit und Unverbundenheit der Beiträge kaum aufweist. Zwar gilt nicht für jeden Beitrag das gleiche Maß an Passung zum jeweiligen systematischen Aspekt, dem er zugeordnet ist, aufs Ganze gesehen ist es indes gelungen, aus dieser Festschrift ein respektables Lese- und Lehrbuch zu machen, das den Stand des Faches resümiert. Dieser Vorzug hätte noch verstärkt werden können, wenn die Herausgeber(innen) den – für eine Festschrift sicher ungewöhnlichen – Schritt vollzogen hätten, den einzelnen Kapiteln Einleitungen voranzustellen.

Ludwig Liegle

Carole L. Hahn (1998). *Becoming Political. Comparative Perspectives on Citizenship Education*. Albany: State University of New York Press. 304 pages.

In *Becoming Political*, an ambitious five-country study of citizenship education, Carole Hahn attempts to address three main areas of inquiry: The similarities and differences of adolescents' political attitudes, the similarities and differences in citizenship education, and the relationship between classroom climate and political attitudes.

Utilizing three main sources of information in order to triangulate her data (5,400

questionnaires; classroom observations; and student and teacher interviews, both group and individual), Hahn's study is a comprehensive investigation of three dimensions of citizenship education: political attitudes, behaviors, and beliefs. An immense undertaking, this study comprises data collected from the United Kingdom, Denmark, the Netherlands, Germany and the United States, and spans three periods of measurement: 1986–86, 1992–93, and 1994–95.

Hahn's expertise as a researcher in both political socialization and the teaching of social studies is clearly reflected in the design of her research instruments, which is scaled to measure political attitudes (interest, efficacy, trust, confidence), political behavior (following news and discussing politics), attitudes towards free speech and free press for diverse groups, beliefs in equal political rights for females as well as males, and perception of a classroom climate that encourages the personal expression of their beliefs regarding controversial issues.

The study reveals several intriguing findings about the political attitudes and beliefs of adolescents (presented in chapter two). For example, within the period from 1986 to 1993/94, scores for political trust, already notoriously low in Western Europe and the United States, dropped an additional twenty percent in the British and American samples. In 1993/94, only fifteen and thirteen percent of British and U.S. adolescents respectively, believed that „people in government care a lot about what all of us think.“ Perceptions of government honesty were even more dramatic. In this area, too, adolescents' view of government honesty were not flattering, to start out with. In 1986, only one-third of all informants believed that „most people in the government are honest,“ however, over the course of the next seven years, this figure dropped another twenty percent, hitting the rock-bottom low of four percent in Germany and six percent in the United States. Interviews with students reconfirmed survey findings of student perceptions of government honesty, indicating a trend of increasing political cynicism among adolescents. Hahn states (p. 102): „Students everywhere were cynical about politicians, citing broken political promises once candidates took office.“

Despite these particular similarities in attitudes, the study also reveals differences between the five samples. For example, Danish adolescents, who appeared to be the most politicized students in the study, often followed current events and participated in discussions with family, friends, and teachers. In part, this difference can be explained by Hahn's observation of the active role Danish schools play in the creation of a political culture in the classroom, where political discussion and participation are valued.

Hahn's analysis is particularly strong when she juxtaposes her findings from the quantitative survey with that of the qualitative data collected from classroom observations, interviews, and educational policy reviews. Hahn integrates the realms of political science and educational research, pointing out discrepancies and contradictions from her findings. In the following three examples, I will attempt to illustrate the means in which Hahn integrates the two disciplines in order to establish findings that pertain to student attitudes, methods of instruction, and perceptions of classroom climate that are conducive to democratic dialogue.

First, the study confirms earlier findings that suggest students' general willingness to extend the right of free expression to everyone. From sixty-seven percent (Netherlands) to eighty-five percent (Denmark) of respondents acknowledged the universal right of free speech. However, when asked whether they would extend these same rights to groups that are perceived as a threat (racists, communists, atheists), their responses varied considerably depending on the group that was perceived to be a threat. In 1986, during the cold-war era of President Reagan and Prime Minister Thatcher, only fifty-six and sixty

percent of British and U.S. students respectively were willing to grant communists the right of free expression. Unsurprisingly, after the breakup of the Soviet Union and the disappearance of communism from the stage of world politics, communists were granted the right to freely and publicly express themselves. In the United Kingdom alone, this figure increased to seventy-seven percent by 1993.

The second example explores whether issues-centered activities, the „problems approach,“ is applied in countries other than the United States, with the aim of „democratic dialogue and open inquiry“ (p. 177). With a background as past president of the National Council for the Social Studies, Hahn offers a glimpse of the social studies debate in the United States which reflects a recurrent theme in the teaching of social studies: the inclusion of „closed areas“ of society, that is, discussion of controversial social, political and economic issues in the classroom, a theme which was more fully developed by M.P. Hunt and L.E. Metcalf (Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1968) in *Teaching High School Social Studies*. Her observation of class lessons in seeking traces of the „problems approach“ in educational systems other than the United States, provides fascinating qualitative findings, which she presents in chapter five (pp. 177–233), „Democratic Inquiry and Discourse: Classroom Climates in Cross-National Perspective.“ In Germany, for example, teachers tended to apply one of two patterns of instruction: teacher-led recitations in the lower grades, and debate-oriented instruction in the higher grades. The first pattern, teacher-led recitation, consists of two parts. The students are assigned various texts to read (textbook, newspaper, journal article) the night prior to social studies class; then, in class, discussions of the readings are led by the teacher. Hahn illuminates the effect of such instruction; she states (p. 209):

„In response to the teacher’s questions, German students raise their index finger and click their fingers if they want to be recognized to give an answer or express an opinion. During the lesson, the teacher writes key words on the board for emphasis and elaborates on points that he or she wants the students to understand. In these teacher-led recitations, a few students tend to answer most of the questions – often elaborating at length. There is little student-to-student interaction.“

Student interviews confirmed findings from her own observations, often answering „same as today, read from a text and talked“ (p. 209). On the other hand, in higher grades, Hahn more frequently encountered the second pattern, more debate-oriented instruction, in which students were encouraged to take different perspectives in arguing for or against a particular political viewpoint.

The third example examines the topics covered in social studies classrooms, an indication of whether social studies teachers not only employ a „problems approach“, but enlist topics that provide a key to understanding controversial issues or „closed areas“ of society. According to Hahn’s study, topics varied enormously among the five countries. German classrooms discussed topics ranging from „Athenian democracy, Napoleon’s movements, events during the Cold War, the European Union, political parties in Parliament, the role of the United Nations in Bosnia, marginal social groups in Germany, and a proposed *Autobahn* that would run through nearby fields“ (p. 209), while in U.S. classrooms, „closed areas“ mainly included social issues and topics on public policy such as capital punishment, gay rights, affirmative action, gun control, immigration policies, euthanasia, homelessness, crimes and punishment, voter turnouts (p. 218 ff.). Social studies in the United States also seem to function as the site in which current events, both public (covered in newspapers, CNN, radio) and school related, are discussed. For both types of events, students are encouraged to reflect on controversial aspects of the events.

Discussions of controversial school events included the institution of policies banning the wearing of baseball hats, rotating school schedules, and the implementation of the athletic program.

Throughout her analysis, Hahn, remaining strictly descriptive and analytical, refrains from over-interpretation. However, by utilizing a more hypothesis-driven research design, her findings may have lent themselves to a greater degree of theory building. In the third example I cited above, I would like to point out that Hahn does not indicate whether the topics discussed in German and U.S. classrooms were, in fact, „closed areas“ in their respective societies. Frankly, there seem to have been „hotter“ political issues than those in the early and mid-nineties. The impact of reunification in German classrooms or U.S. intervention throughout the world (particularly in nations such as Iraq) in U.S. classrooms would most probably, to a much greater extent, shaken up existing taboos than the exploration of Athenian democracy and the Autobahn in Germany or voter turnout and school policy in the United States.

Hahn is perhaps too optimistic with regard to the transformative function of social studies teaching. As educators, of course, we believe in the transformative power of our pedagogical practice, yet, as researchers, we must also analyze the limitations of classroom settings. A comparative analysis of the topics *not* taught in the schools of all five countries may be even more informative. For example, it seems that the German classroom was a site for the discussion of world, national, regional, and local politics, while the U.S. classroom was a site that focused on national politics and social and public policy issues. Equally informative to the list of topics included in classroom discussion, is that of topics that are absent: in Germany, the absence of social and public policy issues; and in the United States, the absence of local and international politics. In addition, rather than engaging in a consensus-driven inquiry process, Hahn might have examined the degree of conflict with regard to topics discussed in social studies classrooms, enabling us to identify „thresholds of controversy“ that determine which topics are socially accepted for classroom discussions and which remain taboo or „closed areas“ *for schools*. For further investigations of the „problems approach“ in social studies teaching it might be useful to distinguish between „closed areas“ for schools and „closed areas“ of society. Some issues are only controversial in a classroom setting, and thus are likely to be discussed in other educative sites of society (among peers, family, community, chat-rooms of the Internet, etc.).

Becoming Political is rich in detail, in both the quantitative sections of the book in which she applies methodologies typical of social science research in measuring political attitudes, behaviors, and beliefs, and in the sections which examine educational practices and pedagogical concerns of social studies teaching. The book cuts across three different fields of study: political science, education (especially, civic education, government studies, social studies, history education, social studies) and comparative and international education. A brilliant combination of quantitative and qualitative data, *Becoming Political* is a masterpiece in comparative methodology. Hopefully, given the immense amount of data collected over a period of ten years, Hahn will continue to further flesh out, analyze, and explain the discrepancies and controversies that she has begun to point out in this landmark study of citizenship education.

Gita Steiner-Khamisi